

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/800,290 03/12/2004		12/2004	Zoltan G. Toth	2664/63006	8258
26646	7590	11/03/2006		EXAMINER	
KENYON &	-	N LLP	DESAI, RITA J		
NEW YORK, NY 10004				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•			1625	· · ·

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-	,
_/	ıl.
ላ	W
- 1	٧
٠,	

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Comments	10/800,290	TOTH ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Rita J. Desai	1625					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Au	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2006.						
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This	action is non-final.	•					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-72 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-72 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the specific production is objected to by the Examine.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)							
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te					

Art Unit: 1625

DETAILED ACTION

Claims pending 1-72.

The rejection of the claims 1-72 under 35 USC 103 over US 6, 506,767 (and WO '450) still stands.

Applicants are arguing that the examiner has not made a Prima facie case.

Changing solvents for recrystalization is routine to those skill in the art.

To show the state of the art the Examiner Quotes; Dr. Elias Corey.

In Eli Lilly and Co. v. Barr Laboratories Inc., 58 USPQ2d 1869 at 1873,

U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit determined that "choosing a suitable recrystallization solvent was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art. In particular, Dr. Elias J. Corey ("Corey"), a Nobel laureate, testified that fluxamime hydrochloride is "generally quite easy to purify by recrystallization". Corey also explained that, although it requires some experimentation, selecting a recrystallization solvent is "very straightforward". Thus, changing the recrystallization solvent would be routine experimentation for the average BS process chemist seeking to achieve higher yields or a higher purity and thereby reduce costs.

Also see In re Aller et al 105 USPQ 233 which states that selection of reaction conditions is merely optimization of routine experimentation.

Applicants argue that Polymorphism and polymorph generation are considered to be unpredictable by those skill in the art. In some cases it may be so however applicants are not making 'new' polymorphs. They are the same form I and II and mixtures of them.

Claims 1-72 all recite changing conditions that are a routine experimentation. Grinding, using solvents heating and then cooling it suddenly to a lower temp, is also clearly shown in the

Application/Control Number: 10/800,290

Art Unit: 1625

reference see examples 4 and 5. on page 18 of the WO '450 patent. Or column 11 of the US '767 patent. Applicants examples are also drawn to heating and then cooling the solid.

Page 3

Applicants definition of anti-solvents includes solvents, thus applicants arguments that using anti-solvents and seeding is not suggested is not convincing. These are routine experimentation for one skilled in the art.

Applicants arguments are not found to be persuasive and the rejection still stands.

Conclusion

Claims 1-72 are rejected.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1625

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rita J. Desai whose telephone number is 571-272-0684. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, flex time..

1.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas McKenzie can be reached on 571-272-0670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rita J. Desai Primary Examiner Art Unit 1625

Desar 106

R.D. October 27, 2006